

REMARKS

The Office Action dated June 24, 2004 has been received and carefully noted.

The following remarks are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Claims 23-31 are currently pending this application. No amendments are made to these claims.

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

Claims 23-27, 30 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arita (U.S. Patent No. 5,821,926) in view of Gasperina (U.S. Patent No. 5,491,781).

In making this rejection, the Office Action takes the position that Arita discloses all of the limitations of claims 23-27, 30 and 31, with the exception of magnifying only the selected button into a predetermined size in longitudinal and lateral directions and displaying the magnified button.

The Office Action asserts that Gasperina corrects this deficiency by disclosing a method and means for displaying a graphical image in a window equipped with scroll bars.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reasons set forth below.

Claims 23 and 30 are independent and claims 24-27 and 31 depend respectively therefrom. Independent claims 23 and 30 recite, in part:

displaying a tool bar composed of plural buttons...selecting
an arbitrary button in said tool bar; and

magnifying only said selected button into a predetermined size in longitudinal and lateral directions and displaying magnified button.

As recited in the claimed invention, a tool bar having plural buttons is displayed, an arbitrary button is selected, and only the selected button is magnified into a predetermined size in both longitudinal and lateral directions. Thus, the selected button of the claimed invention is magnified such that the button may be “recognized easily.” *See Patent Application Serial No. 09/393,576, at p. 13, lines 20-21.*

The Office Action cites the Abstract, col. 11, lines 15-45 and col. 15, line 13 – col. 16, line 54 of Arita for allegedly disclosing “magnifying and displaying said selected button.” However, it is respectfully submitted that these passages of Arita include no disclosure or suggestion of “magnifying and displaying said selected button.” Rather, these passages of Arita disclose a method of creating new buttons, i.e., generating an operating button by setting a button class, setting a button group and setting individual buttons and displaying combinations of button groups and individual buttons. *See Arita at the Abstract and col. 11, lines 15-45.*

Further, at col. 14, line 56 – col. 15, line 22, Arita discloses displaying a tool bar having a plurality of buttons (Fig. 7a) and performing a series of button selections to create new “summary” buttons (“Major Store and New Store” of Figs. 7b and 7c). Selection of the newly created “summary” buttons emulates the effects of the first button selections, so that a user can thereafter avoid performing the first button selections by instead selecting the new “summary” buttons. Arita discloses displaying the newly created “summary” buttons as part of the original tool bar as illustrated in Figs. 7c and 8a. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that Arita discloses creating and

displaying new “summary” buttons, but fails to disclose or suggest “magnifying and displaying said selected button,” as suggested by the outstanding Office Action.

The cited window of Gasperina is used to display a graphical image and the scroll bars are used to vary a portion of the graphical image displayed in the window. Gasperina discloses at col. 4, lines 23-26, that when the window is “resized” by dragging a side scroll bar thereof, the image displayed within the window is scaled to provide the effect of zooming in on a portion of the graph.

Thus, combining the scroll bar equipped window of Gasperina with the toolbar of Arita would result in a scroll bar equipped window displaying the tool bar of Arita. By manipulating the scroll bars of this window, a user may zoom in on a portion of the toolbar. Zooming in on a portion of the tool bar would result in a portion of the toolbar being zoomed in on and displayed in the window. This is different from “selecting an arbitrary button of said toolbar and magnifying only said selected button,” as recited in the claimed invention and illustrated in Fig. 31 of the subject application. Neither Arita nor Gasperina discloses a manner by which only a selected button of Arita would be magnified.

Further, assuming that the Office Action intends to suggest that the newly created “summary buttons” of Arita are magnified and displayed, Applicants respectfully note that the new “summary” buttons of Arita are not a part of the original toolbar of Arita. These new “summary” buttons are created upon selection of various buttons of the original toolbar. Thus, even if the new “summary” buttons of Arita were displayed in a separate scroll bar equipped window, this would not be the same as “selecting an arbitrary button of said toolbar and magnifying only said selected button,” as recited in

the claimed invention. Additionally, even if the new "summary" buttons of Arita were displayed in a separate scroll bar equipped window, there is no disclosure in either reference to suggest that these new "summary" buttons would be magnified. Magnification of the new buttons would be dependent upon user manipulation of the scrollbars, and would result in the loss of a portion of the new buttons from the display window.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 23 and 30 are not anticipated nor rendered obvious by the combination of cited references, and are in condition for allowance. As claims 24-27 and 31 depend, respectively, from claims 23 and 30, claims 24-27 and 31 are allowable for at least the reasons claims 23 and 30 are allowable. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arita in view of Gasperina and further in view of Schindler (U.S. Patent No. 5,675,390). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reasons set forth below.

Claim 29 is independent and claim 28 depends from claim 23. Claims 23 and 29 recite, in part:

displaying a tool bar composed of plural buttons...
selecting, by a remote control, an arbitrary button in said tool bar; and
magnifying only said selected button into a predetermined size in longitudinal and lateral directions and displaying magnified button.

Schindler was cited for disclosing the use of a wireless remote control to select an arbitrary button. Schindler, however, fails to disclose magnifying only a selected button into a predetermined size in longitudinal and lateral directions and displaying the magnified button, as recited in claims 28 and 29. Since the combination of Arita and Gasperina also fails to disclose this limitation for at the least the reasons set forth above, it follows that the combination of Arita, Gasperina and Schindler similarly fails to disclose this limitation.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claims 28 and 29 are patentably distinct over the combination of references and in condition for allowance. Furthermore, claim 28 depends from claim 23 and as such, claim 28 is allowable for at least the reasons claim 23 is allowable. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

For at least the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 23-31 are patentably distinct over the cited references. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and an issuance of a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner determine that any further action is necessary to place this application into better form, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned representative at the number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper,

may be charged to counsel's Deposit Account No. 01-2300, **referencing Attorney**

Docket No. 101216-09002.

Respectfully submitted,

ARENT FOX, PLLC

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michele L. Connell", is written over the printed name.

Michele L. Connell

Registration No. 52,763

Customer No. 004372

1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 400

Washington, DC 20036-5339

Telephone: (202) 857-6104

Facsimile: (202) 857-6395

MLC:sg